

REMARKS

Claims 11-16, 18-19, 29-34, 36-37, 38-42, and 44-45 are pending, of which claims 11, 29, and 38 are independent computer program product claims.

The Office Action rejected independent method claims 2 and 20 (and presumably the corresponding dependent claims 3-7, 9-10, 21-25, and 27-28) under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Although Applicants disagree with this rejection, Applicants have canceled method claims 2-7, 9-10, 20-25, and 27-28 by this paper only in order to expedite allowance, and therefore reserve the right to present the canceled method claims in a continuation, if Applicant so desired.

The Office Action rejected all claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,157. With this response, Applicants have submitted a terminal disclaimer, including a copy of the assignment filed in U.S. Patent No. 6,332,157 to show common ownership.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 12th day of November, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
ERIC M. KAMERATH
Registration No. 46,081
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 022913